

REMARKS

Claims 3-5, 7, 9-20, 23 and 24 are pending. By this Amendment, Claims 6 and 22 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer; Claims 3-4, 7, 9, 16 and 20 are amended; and Claim 24 is added. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is submitted herein.

Allowed Claims

Applicants respectfully acknowledge and appreciate the indication by the Examiner that Claims 15 and 17 are allowed.

Claims 3-5, 7, 9-14, 16, 18-20, 23 and 24 Also Recite Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3-7, 20 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Published Patent Application Number 2004/0232813 to Nakano et al. (Nakano). Claims 16 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakano in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,255,778 to Yoshikawa et al. (Yoshikawa). Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakano in view of U.S. Published Patent Application Number 2003/0085649 to Wachi et al. (Wachi). Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakano in view of Wachi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,417,619 to Yasunori et al. (Yasunori).

Applicants respectfully traverse all of the rejections for the following reason(s).

Claim 23 recites a flat display apparatus having a flat display panel, including an optical filter attached to a display screen surface of the flat display panel by a transparent adhesive material, the optical filter being formed by laminating an ambient light

antireflective layer, an infrared-radiation absorbing and color-tone correcting layer and an electromagnetic-wave blocking layer, ***wherein the transparent adhesive material has an adhesive strength of 3 kgf/inch or less when being vertically detached.***

Nakano explains that it is preferable to use a 30-micrometer thick adhesive. Specifically, in paragraph [0316], Nakano clearly states that when a 30-micrometer thick polyester film is stuck on a 3 mm-thick glass sheet using a 30-micrometer-thick adhesive, the adhesive shows the 180° peeling strength after holding for 10 days at 80° C. of 300 g/cm, preferably 400 g/cm.

Generally, when a film having relatively thin thickness, for example 30-micrometer thick polyester film, is peeled in a direction 180°, the power to peel the film acts on the peeled linear portion of the film. Therefore, the power to peel becomes a relatively small value, for example 30 g/cm (= 0.762 kgf/inch).

However, the optical filter of the present invention has thick thickness, for example 0.5 mm. When the optical filter with a relatively thick thickness, for example 0.5 mm, is peeled in a vertical direction, the power to peel acts on a rather large area of the peeled portion and not just the peeled linear portion, as in Nakano. Therefore, power to peel becomes a comparatively large value.

Applicants provide herein a sketch of Nakano and the present invention to better explain the region across which the power to peel is affected. For example, in Nakano, the power to peel acts only on the linear portion of the polyester film being peeled off the adhesive. The power to peel acts on a line corresponding to the linear location from which the film is being removed or pulled off the adhesive. In the claimed invention, as

shown in the attached sketch, the power to peel acts on the entire region (that is, the length and width) of the optical filter being peeled off the adhesive.

The transparent adhesive material of the optical filter in Claim 23 of the present application has an adhesive strength of 3 kgf/inch or less when being vertically detached, therefore the optical filter is peeled off or made to exfoliate from the flat display panel without causing any damage.

As stated above, Claim 23 of the present application recites the peel strength of the adhesive when detaching an optical filter from a panel. Nakano merely provide the adhesion strength of the adhesive and not the peel strength.

Based on the above, Applicants respectfully submit that Nakano does not disclose, teach or suggest each and every feature recited by Claim 23.

To qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102, a single reference must teach, i.e., identically describe, each feature of a rejected claim. As explained above, Nakano fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature recited by Claim 23. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit Nakano does not anticipate or render obvious the invention recited by Claim 23. As such, Applicants respectfully submit Claim 23 should be deemed allowable over Nakano.

Yoshikawa is cited for teaching the use of a chassis member in contact with an EM wave-blocking layer. Plus, the adhesive material used on the display of Yoshikawa is a thermoplastic adhesion resin with an adhesive force that is obtained by being cooled after dissolution by heat. Therefore, Yoshikawa does not overcome or otherwise cure the above described deficiencies of Nakano.

Wachi is cited for teaching the use of recesses formed in an infrared radiation absorbing layer and antireflection film in order to expose a side portion of an EM wave blocking layer. The adhesive material used on the display of Wachi is a thermoplastic adhesion resin, an UV cure adhesive resin having an adhesive force that is obtained after being cured by UV, or a thermoset adhesion resin with an adhesive force that is obtained after being cured by heat. Therefore, Wachi does not overcome or otherwise cure the above described deficiencies of Nakano.

Yasunori is cited for teaching the use of a darkening conductive mesh of the EM wave blocking layer for a PDP in order to improve contrast by reducing flicker or glare and therefore does not overcome or otherwise cure the above described deficiencies of Nakano.

To establish *prima facie* obviousness, each and every feature recited by a rejected claim must be taught or at least suggested by the applied art of record. See M.P.E.P. §2143.03. As explained above, Nakano, Yoshikawa, Wachi, and Yasunori, alone or in any combination thereof, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature recited by Claim 23. Therefore, Claim 23 is not rendered obvious in view of the teachings of the Nakano, Yoshikawa, Wachi and Yasunori. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit Claim 23 is allowable over any combination of Nakano, Yoshikawa, Wachi and Yasunori.

Claims 3-5, 7, 9-14, 16, 18-20 and 24 depend from Claim 23. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims be deemed allowable at least for the same reason(s) Claim 23 is allowable, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Withdrawal of all the rejections is respectfully requested.


Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejections, allowance of Claims 3-5, 7, 9-20, 23 and 24, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event that the filing of this paper is not deemed timely, Applicants petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any petition fee for the extension of time and any other fees that may be required in relation to this paper can be charged to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing Docket No. 107156.00216.**

Respectfully submitted,



Murat Ozgur
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,275

Customer No. 004372

ARENT FOX LLP
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810

MO:elp

Enclosure: Sketch